

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/741,808 | 12/19/2003 | Brent S. Baxter | 884.B82US1 | 2599 | |
| 21186 7590 02/07/2007 SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A. P.O. BOX 2938 | | | EXAMINER | | |
| | | | XU, KEVIN K | | |
| MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| | | | 2628 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 02/07/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | | Applicant(s) | |
|-----------------|-------------|---------------|--|
| 10/741,808 | | BAXTER ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Kevin K. Xu | 2628 | |

| | NOVIII IX. Nu | 1 2020 | |
|--|---|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the d | correspondence addi | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>16 January 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods: | ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in | fidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 CF | ce, which R 41.31; or (3) |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin | g date of the final rejection | on. |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 | 06.07(f). | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL | tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da | of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Office | ate extension fee be action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | o avoid dismissal of the | s of the date of e appeal. Since |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo | nsideration and/or search (see NO | | ecause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beta | | educing or simplifying t | he issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a | corresponding number of finally re | jected claims. | |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1 | | , | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 | | ompliant Amendment (| PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) | | , | |
| Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). | lowable if submitted in a separate, | | |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro- | | ill be entered and an e | xplanation of |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: <u>6-10</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>0-70</u> . Claim(s) objected to: | | • | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-5 and 11-20</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida | lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is | t be entered necessary and |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar | overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | eal and/or appellant fai | ls to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | | |
| The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet. | it does NOT place the application | in condition for allowar | nce because: |
| 12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). | (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | an . I | |
| 13. Other: | (| Maryn | |
| | | | |
| | | MARK ZIMMER | |

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The new issues include: Applicant has amended independent claim 1 after a final rejection, changing the scope of the claim by adding the recitation of "acquiring a pluarlity of graphical user interface objects, shifting the graphical user interface object to form one or more shifted objects, blending the one or more shifted objects and graphical user interface objects to form one of the pluarlity of blurred copies of the object." and also changing the scope of independent claim 16 by adding the recitation of "before applying the shifted and blended texture information of the object". This raises new issues that require further consideration and/or search.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: applicant relies on limitations in the proposed amendment which has not been entered. See note for item 3 above.